

ARTICLE APPEARED
ON PAGE A1

THE WASHINGTON POST
27 December 1981

Haig Sees Continuing Risk Of Soviet Action in Poland

Resistance 'Will Continue'

By Don Oberdorfer and John M. Goshko

Washington Post Staff Writers

Secretary of State Alexander M. Haig Jr. said yesterday that martial law in Poland has not succeeded and that the danger of Soviet intervention may be greater than it was before the military crackdown two weeks ago.

Haig, in an interview with The Washington Post, said, "Passive resistance in my view will continue, and it will be aggravated by the consequences of economic stagnation and social-economic privation."

He said it is "much too early" to conclude that the danger of direct Soviet intervention has receded, adding, "I think it may even be more possible than before these events occurred." [Excerpts from the interview are on Page A6].

"Martial law has not succeeded, and it would be premature to suggest that it had," Haig said. "Once the decision was made to institute repression, the prospects of applying what is necessary to achieve that outcome are stronger rather than weaker."

He also said "the calculus" in future choices in Warsaw and Moscow has been affected by the decision, after months of pained tolerance, to resort to force against the Solidarity union movement.

While communications between Poland and the Soviet Union are reported by U.S. intelligence to be extremely active, there has been no report of major troop movements in Russia that would presage direct Soviet intervention. Haig's concern, as he expressed it, seemed to be based primarily on the continuing danger of bloodshed and civil strife that could not be contained by Polish authorities.

According to Haig, Gen. Wojciech Jaruzelski imposed martial law "either in response to Soviet pressure or as a decision made in Moscow." Haig did not say conclusively which he believes to be true.

Haig said Jaruzelski's address to the Polish people on Christmas Eve was the first response to President Reagan's televised remarks on Poland Wednesday night and his personal letter to Jaruzelski of the day before. Haig suggested

that the postponement of Jaruzelski's speech from Wednesday, its previously expected time, until Thursday was in order for the Polish general to hear first what Reagan had to say.

Haig said Jaruzelski's speech was "extremely moderate in tone" but added that it failed to contain assurances that martial law is being revised. Haig noted that the initial actions of the Polish leadership, which he described as "a military junta" that has supplanted the government and the Communist Party, were couched in moderate language but were "steely" in character.

Haig said that the internal dynamics in Poland, including reports of discussions between the generals and the influential Roman Catholic Church, suggest that a move toward reconciliation "is still a possibility."

In assessing Jaruzelski's role, Haig discussed two broad schools of thought: that the Polish leader is "a patriotic nationalist" seeking to preempt Soviet intervention, or that he is "a Soviet proxy" seeking to turn back the clock in Poland to the days before the rise of Solidarity as an independent union in August, 1980.

"I think either of these extremes is a misreading," he said. "The truth is somewhere between the two, but probably closer to the latter."

Haig cautioned against accepting either judgment in full, apparently because of the consequences of either conclusion. If martial law is seen as a nationalist effort to stave off the Russians, the West might be expected to support it. U.S. policy at present runs strongly in the other direction.

If, on the other hand, Jaruzelski is a Soviet surrogate and the Russians are dictating the action, there would seem to be little chance for outside leverage on the Polish crackdown, Haig agreed. But he added, "There's much evidence to challenge that theory in its extreme."

CONTINUED